

**Remarks**

Further and favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks.

Claims 1, 6 and 18-20 have been amended to limit the reactive functional group. Support for these amendments is found on page 7, line 29 through page 9, line 5 of Applicants' specification. Additionally, claim 1 has been amended to delete the "capable of" language, in response to the Examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Claims 4, 13 and 14 have been amended to delete "deprotonation reaction". Claims 5, 7, 15-17 and 34 have been cancelled without prejudice. Additionally, withdrawn claims 8-11 and 22-33 have been cancelled without prejudice to Applicants' rights under 35 U.S.C. 121 to file a divisional application for the non-elected subject matter.

Although these amendments are presented after final rejection, they are intended to place the application in condition for allowance. Therefore, the Examiner is respectfully requested to enter the amendments.

The rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite has been rendered moot in view of the claim amendments.

The patentability of the present invention over the disclosures of the references relied upon by the Examiner in rejecting the claims will be apparent upon consideration of the following remarks.

The rejection of claims 1-7 and 12-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Garnett et al. (U.S. '736) or JP '574, or Frey et al. (U.S. '654) or Sugo et al. (U.S. '400) is respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, the claims have been amended to limit the reactive functional group to one selected from the group consisting of hypochlorite ion, periodate ion, peroxide ion, chromate ion, dichromate ion, perruthenate ion, tetrahydroborate ion, cyanotrihydroborate ion, tribromide ion, cyanide ion, thiocyanate ion, azide ion and nitrite ion. None of the references cited by the Examiner teach or suggest a solid reagent comprising a reactive functional group, as recited in Applicants' amended claims.

Therefore, the invention of claims 1-7 and 12-21 is clearly patentable over the cited references. In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is submitted that each of the grounds of rejection set forth by the Examiner has been overcome, and that the application is in condition for allowance. Such allowance is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Makoto KOMATSU et al.

By:



Amy E. Pulliam  
Registration No. 55,965  
Attorney for Applicants

AEP/nrj  
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021  
Telephone (202) 721-8200  
Facsimile (202) 721-8250  
March 2, 2006